

## PGPU – Land Use Framework – Bill Rinehart’s notes and questions

### 1. General:

- a. How will Smart Code standards be incorporated into the GP and new development code? Is CPSP area going to be included in GPU? Will the CPSP remain a stand-alone specific plan? Will it be updated along with the new Code?
- b. In several “areas of change”, I question the selection of parcels designated for change, and ignoring of many adjacent opportunity sites.
- c. Minimum height might be too restrictive, based on what we’ve heard
- d. Repeated references to “Preserving Landmarks” Should be “Preserve Historic resources and contributors...”
- e. More mention of Trees as a means of improving land uses
- f. Need to sunset VRBO’s to reclaim housing
- g. Do not state specifically “Native” tree plantings. Especially in the east side where clay soils don’t support our “native” trees
- h. Fairwest market and creamery store could be shown as micro neighborhood center model

### 2. Land Use Designations

#### a. Residential

- i. MDR, HDR permit limited commercial/office...When abutting arterial? Is this consistent with the desire to have neighborhood pop-up/garage retail and services?
- ii. Why is “Mobile/Manufactured” a designation? Shouldn’t this just be an allowed type within DLD and MD?
- iii. There should be a provision within these designations for residential parcels to be conglomerated and converted to neighborhood services, commercial, MU, activity zones

#### b. Mixed Use

- i. Do we need so many MU classifications? Should these be more general with specific FAR/Densities controlled by zoning? Are we confident enough to have the GP be so prescriptive?
- ii. There should be a “Transect” type graphic to describe the range of MU districts
- iii. It should be stated that a goal of certain MU districts is to encourage residences in activity/commercial centers
- iv. Flex: If this is to be applied to historic ag industry parcels, it needs to also permit industrial uses.
- v. There should be an MU designation that allows industrial, to provide for this type of artisan industrial live-work
- vi. General: Add language that allows/encourages “Arts”, “Entertainment”, “Educational”, “indoor recreational” and other “destination” uses
- vii. If GP prescribes “Minimum Heights” there should be a provision for allowing lower buildings, and stepped/feathered building heights
- viii. MU designations adjacent to existing residential should allow for step-backs and transitional massing

- c. Commercial:
    - i. Are there places where we want NC and CC without housing?
    - ii. Is housing permitted in these designations (not stated)?
    - iii. Business park: Retail and Restaurants should be encouraged so everyone doesn't have to drive somewhere at lunchtime. Is this an obsolete designation?
    - iv. Maker/micro-business: As described it seems this should include Live/work opportunities also. Maybe restrict dwellings to upper floors? Or maximum percentage of floor area?
  - d. Industrial:
    - i. Restaurants need to be allowed and encouraged so people don't have to drive at lunch time
    - ii. Existing industrial parcels should stay industrial as long as they have active uses or useable facilities. These should be re-designated only as part of owner-initiated GP amendment (with few exceptions)
  - e. Open Space:
    - i. Is there a way to incorporate an Overlay in the GPLU map that applies designations for "Wildlife Corridors" or other "Ecological benefit zones" on top of other LUD's? (in addition to what is shown in other elements of GP)
    - ii. Floodway: Is FIRM map still appropriate designator?
3. Areas of Change
- a. Existing and proposed parks – English Hill not indicated as "Area of Change" but is shown on parks map
  - b. Upstream River Adjacent: Why are parcels adjacent to tracks not being considered for change?
  - c. Downstream river adjacent: Why "Maker/Micro-bus" not MU1? If they are "micro-bus" they will be inherently "mixed" Seems overly restrictive to have so much area be "micro", especially when this is already developed land. Also should not exclude residential
  - d. T8 should: How is Minimum height applied?
  - e. River park: too prescriptive, with block Land-use designations. Can't it be considered all horizontal MU and the developer can figure out what goes where?
  - f. PBN – prefer the feathering alt 1 (except several historic contributors between wash-oak Why target these parcels and not the junk buildings to the north and east? Questioning the parcel selection
  - g. Casa: don't be too prescriptive and change LUD mid-parcel, all MU1 or 2. Developer can sort out.
  - h. PBS: prefer symmetry of corridors, alt 2. Don't expect much 4-story, but should be allowed if someone has the appetite
  - i. Vet's building: Alt 3 with perimeter stepping
  - j. Western at Baker: keep industrial until owner initiates GPA
  - k. East Washington: Pending Fairgrounds Master planning, it may be appropriate to have higher density adjacent. This could be "City Center" in the future. Make consistent, but be cautious of minimum heights.

- l. Leghorn: NC should allow for housing, therefore Alt 1 seems like a no-change alt. What is the goal? Re-develop or incentivize adding housing and more flexibility?
  - m. Outlets: Alt 2 makes little sense. Why convert existing retail center to “Maker”? Instead, allow arts/entertainment, and maker spaces in MU
  - n. Washington at Mcdowell should be major town centers. If not here, where?
- 4. Chapter 1 Evolution of the City
  - a. Goal LU-2 Preserving open space
    - i. Action: establish ecological benefit zones and easements
  - b. LU-5.2 Enhance focused riverfront development
- 5. Chapter 2 – 15 minute city (p. 84)
  - a. Outlet mall not ped friendly town center. Needs improved accessibility or be a transit hub
  - b. Add “Redwood Gateway” as Town center
  - c. LU-7 needs to include sunsetting VRBO’s
- 6. Chapter 3 Community Design and Character
  - i. LU 10.1 Not “heritage landmarks, but “contributors to overall historic character”
  - ii. Action LU-10.1.1 Conduct a city-wide inventory of historic resources
  - b. LU-11.2 Corridor Aesthetics
    - i. Planted medians not as important as Street Trees
    - ii. Consolidated off-street parking (behind buildings)
  - c. LU-12 High Quality Design
    - i. Action LU-12.1.x Re-establish Design review committee
    - ii. LU-12.2 change “Encourage” to “Require”
  - d. LU-13 Adaptive re-use – Excellent!
- 7. Sub-Areas (need a map showing boundaries)
  - a. Downtown 2p-21 improve connections to transit center
- 8. Washinton street
  - a. Main Street Corridor, primary connection between east and west, center of city
- 9. Glossary: Trees, lose the word “visual”